arXiv:1605.03989v3 [math.OC] 2 Jan 2017

Some new results on sample path optimality in ergodic control of diffusions

Ari Arapostathis *
University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA

Abstract

We present some new results on sample path optimality for the ergodic control problem of a class of non-degenerate diffusions controlled through the drift. The hypothesis most often used in the literature to ensure the existence of an a.s. sample path optimal stationary Markov control requires finite second moments of the first hitting times τ of bounded domains over all admissible controls. We show that this can be considerably weakened: $\mathbb{E}[\tau^2]$ may be replaced with $\mathbb{E}[\tau \ln^+(\tau)]$, thus reducing the required rate of convergence of averages from polynomial to logarithmic. A Foster–Lyapunov condition which guarantees this is also exhibited. Moreover, we study a large class of models that are neither uniformly stable, nor have a near-monotone running cost, and we exhibit sufficient conditions for the existence of a sample path optimal stationary Markov control.

Index Terms

ergodic control, sample path optimality, controlled diffusion, subgeometric ergodicity, empirical measures.

I. Introduction

Sample path optimality in the ergodic control of diffusions has been studied in [1]–[4]. For the analogous problem in Markov decision processes (MDP) we refer the reader to [5]–[12]. In this paper we focus on non-degenerate diffusions with a compact action space and controlled through the drift.

Consider a controlled diffusion process $X = \{X_t,\ t \ge 0\}$ taking values in the d-dimensional Euclidean space $\mathbb{R}^d$, and governed by the Itô stochastic differential equation

$$\mathrm{d}X_t \,=\, b(X_t, U_t)\,\mathrm{d}t + \upsigma(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}W_t\,. \tag{1}$$

All random processes in (1) live in a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, \mathbb{P})$. The process W is a d-dimensional standard Wiener process independent of the initial condition X_0. The control process U takes values in a compact, metrizable set $\mathbb{U}$, and $U_t(\omega)$ is jointly measurable in $(t,\omega) \in [0,\infty) \times \Omega$. Moreover, it is *non-anticipative*: for $s < t$, $W_t - W_s$ is independent of $\mathfrak{F}_s$ which is defined as the the completion of $\sigma\{X_0, U_r, W_r,\ r \le s\}$ relative to $(\mathfrak{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Such a process U is called an *admissible control*, and we let $\mathfrak{U}$ denote the set of all admissible controls. We impose the usual assumptions on the data of the model to guarantee the existence and uniqueness of solutions to (1). These are described in Section I-A.

We adopt the relaxed control framework [4, Section 2.3]. Thus, we extend the definition of U so that it takes values in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{U})$, the space of probability measures on the Borel sets of $\mathbb{U}$, and for a function $f\colon \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U}$, we let $f(\cdot\,, U_s) \equiv \int_{\mathbb{U}} f(\cdot\,, u)\, U_s(\mathrm{d}u)$. For further details on relaxed controls see [4, Section 2.3]. Since the set of optimal stationary controls, if nonempty, always contains precise controls, the 'relaxation' of the problem that allows $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{U})$-valued controls results in the same optimal value as the original problem. Thus, adopting relaxed controls serves only to facilitate the analysis.

Let $c\colon \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function bounded from below, which without loss of generality we assume is nonnegative, referred to as the *running cost*. As is well known, the ergodic control problem, in its *almost sure* (or *pathwise*) formulation, seeks to a.s. minimize over all admissible controls U the functional

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty}\ \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t c(X_s, U_s)\,\mathrm{d}s\,. \tag{2}$$

In equation (2), X_s denotes the process under the control U.

†This work was supported in part by the Office of Naval Research under the Electric Ship Research and Development Consortium, and in part by a grant from the Army Research Office.

A weaker, *average* formulation seeks to minimize

$$\varrho_U \;:=\; \limsup_{t\to\infty}\; \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t \mathbb{E}^U\big[c(X_s,U_s)\big]\,\mathrm{d}s\,. \tag{3}$$

In this equation, $\mathbb{E}^U$ denotes the expectation operator associated with the probability measure on the canonical space of the process under the control U. We define the *optimal ergodic value* $\varrho_* := \inf_{U\in\mathfrak{U}} \varrho_U$, i.e., the infimum of (3) over all admissible controls. We say that an admissible control $\hat{U}$ is *average cost optimal* if $\varrho_{\hat{U}} = \varrho_*$. Also, an average cost optimal control $\hat{U}$ is called *sample path optimal*, or *pathwise optimal*, if

$$\limsup_{t\to\infty}\; \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t c(X_s,\hat{U}_s)\,\mathrm{d}s \;\le\; \liminf_{t\to\infty}\; \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t c(X_s,U_s)\,\mathrm{d}s \tag{4}$$

a.s., for all $U\in\mathfrak{U}$. It is evident that (4) asserts a much stronger optimality for $\hat{U}$, viz., the most "pessimistic" pathwise cost under $\hat{U}$ is no worse than the most "optimistic" pathwise cost under any other admissible control.

For a control $U\in\mathfrak{U}$ we define the process ζ_t^U of empirical measures as a $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{U})$-valued process satisfying

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{U}} f\,\mathrm{d}\zeta_t^U \;=\; \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t\int_{\mathbb{U}} f(X_s,u)U_s(\mathrm{d}u)\,\mathrm{d}s\,,\quad t>0\,, \tag{5}$$

for all $f\in\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{U})$, where X denotes the solution of the diffusion in (1) under the control U. Suppose for simplicity that the running cost is bounded. It is then well known that a sufficient condition for the existence of a *pathwise optimal* stationary Markov control is that the family $\big\{\zeta_t^U : t\ge 0\big\}$ is a.s. tight in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{U})$ [4, Theorem 3.4.7]. The hypothesis most often used in the literature to guarantee the tightness of the family $\{\zeta_t^U\}$, requires that the second moments of the first hitting time of some bounded domain be bounded uniformly over X_0 in a compact set, and all admissible controls $U\in\mathfrak{U}$.

We define the family of operators $\mathcal{L}^u\colon \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)\mapsto\mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ by

$$\mathcal{L}^u f(x) \;=\; \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j} a^{ij}(x)\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}(x) + \sum_i b^i(x,u)\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(x) \tag{6}$$

for $u\in\mathbb{U}$. We refer to $\mathcal{L}^u$ as the *controlled extended generator* of the diffusion. A Foster–Lyapunov condition which is sufficient for the uniform boundedness of the second moments of hitting times is the following: There exist a bounded domain $D\subset\mathbb{R}^d$, and nonnegative functions $\mathcal{V}_1$ and $\mathcal{V}_2$ in $\mathcal{C}^2(\bar{D}^c)\cap\mathcal{C}(D^c)$ which satisfy

$$\mathcal{L}^u\mathcal{V}_1 \;\le\; -1\,,\quad\text{and}\quad \mathcal{L}^u\mathcal{V}_2 \;\le\; -\mathcal{V}_1 \qquad \text{on } \bar{D}^c\,, \tag{7}$$

for all $u\in\mathbb{U}$. Here, $\bar{D}$ and D^c denote the closure and the complement of D, respectively. Let $\tau(D)$ denote the first hitting time of the set D for the process in (1), and define $\mathbb{E}_x^U[\,\cdot\,] := \mathbb{E}^U[\,\cdot \mid X_0=x]$, with $x\in\mathbb{R}^d$. The Foster–Lyapunov condition in (7) implies that $\mathbb{E}_x^U[\tau(D)\mid X_0=x]\le\mathcal{V}_1(x)$, and $\mathbb{E}_x^U\big[\tau(D)^2\big]\le 2\mathcal{V}_2(x)$ for all $U\in\mathfrak{U}$ and $x\in D^c$ [4, Lemma 2.5.1].

The hypothesis that second moments of hitting times are bounded can be considerably weakened. As we show in this paper, a sufficient condition for the the family $\big\{\zeta_t^U\big\}$ to be a.s. tight is

$$\sup_{x\in K}\;\sup_{U\in\mathfrak{U}}\; \mathbb{E}_x^U\big[\tau(D)\,\ln^+(\tau(D))\big] \;<\;\infty$$

for any compact set $K\subset D^c$, where $\ln^+$ denotes the positive part of the natural logarithm. We also show that the second inequality in (7) may be replaced by $\mathcal{L}^u\mathcal{V}_2\le -\ln^+(\mathcal{V}_1)$.

A. The model

The following assumptions are in effect throughout the paper.

(A1) *Local Lipschitz continuity:* The functions

$$b=\big[b^1,\dots,b^d\big]^{\mathsf{T}}\colon \mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{U}\mapsto\mathbb{R}^d$$

and $\sigma = \bigl[\sigma^{ij}\bigr] : \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ are locally Lipschitz in x with a Lipschitz constant κ_R depending on $R > 0$. In other words, if B_R denotes the open ball of radius R centered at the origin in $\mathbb{R}^d$, then for all $x, y \in B_R$ and $u \in \mathbb{U}$,

$$|b(x,u) - b(y,u)| + \|\sigma(x) - \sigma(y)\| \;\le\; \kappa_R |x-y|\,,$$

where $\|\sigma\|^2 := \operatorname{trace}\bigl(\sigma\sigma^{\mathsf{T}}\bigr)$. We also assume that b is continuous in (x,u).

(A2) *Affine growth condition:* b and σ satisfy a global growth condition of the form

$$|b(x,u)|^2 + \|\sigma(x)\|^2 \;\le\; \kappa_1\bigl(1+|x|^2\bigr)$$

for all $(x,u) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U}$.

(A3) *Local non-degeneracy:* Let $a := \sigma\,\sigma^{\mathsf{T}}$. For each $R > 0$, we have

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} a^{ij}(x)\xi_i\xi_j \;\ge\; \kappa_R^{-1}|\xi|^2 \qquad \forall x \in B_R\,,$$

for all $\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

(A4) The running cost function $c\colon \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ is continuous.

The conditions in (A1)–(A3) are standard assumptions on the drift b and the diffusion matrix σ to guarantee existence and uniqueness of solutions to (1). The running cost c is usually assumed to be locally Lipschitz in its first argument. However, this is only used to obtain regular solutions to the Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman equation, something which does not concern us in this paper.

B. Markov controls

Of fundamental importance in the study of functionals of X is Itô's formula. For $f \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and with $\mathcal{L}^u$ as defined in (6), it holds that

$$f(X_t) \;=\; f(X_0) + \int_0^t \mathcal{L}^{U_s} f(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}s + M_t\,, \quad \text{a.s.}, \tag{8}$$

where

$$M_t \;:=\; \int_0^t \bigl\langle \nabla f(X_s), \sigma(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}W_s \bigr\rangle$$

is a local martingale.

Recall that a control is called *Markov* if $U_t = v(t, X_t)$ for a measurable map $v\colon \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{U})$, and it is called *stationary Markov* if v does not depend on t, i.e., $v\colon \mathbb{R}^d \mapsto \mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{U})$. It is well known that under Assumptions (A1)–(A3), under any Markov control v, the stochastic differential equation in (1) has a unique strong solution [13].

Let $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{SM}}$ denote the set of stationary Markov controls. Under any $v \in \mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{SM}}$, the process X is strong Markov, and we denote its transition function by $P_t^v(x,\cdot)$. It also follows from the work of [14], [15] that under any $v \in \mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{SM}}$, the transition probabilities of X have densities which are locally Hölder continuous. Thus $\mathcal{L}^v$ defined by

$$\mathcal{L}^v f(x) \;=\; \sum_{i,j} a^{ij}(x)\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(x) + \sum_i b^i(x, v(x))\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}(x)$$

for $v \in \mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{SM}}$ and $f \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, is the generator of a strongly-continuous semigroup on $\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$, which is strong Feller, i.e., if f is bounded measurable function f, and $t > 0$, then the map $x \mapsto \mathbb{E}[f(X_t) \mid X_0 = x]$ is continuous. We let $\mathbb{P}_x^v$ denote the probability measure and $\mathbb{E}_x^v$ the expectation operator on the canonical space of the process under the control $v \in \mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{SM}}$, conditioned on the process X starting from $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ at $t = 0$. The operator $\mathcal{L}^U$ for $U \in \mathfrak{U}$ is analogously defined.

In the next section, we summarize the notation used in the paper.

C. Notation

The standard Euclidean norm in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted by $|\cdot|$, and $\mathbb{R}_+$ stands for the set of non-negative real numbers. The closure, the complement, and the indicator function of a set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ are denoted by $\bar{A}$, A^c, and $\mathbb{1}_A$, respectively. We denote by $\tau(A)$ the first hitting time of $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, i.e.,

$$\tau(A) \;:=\; \inf\{t \geq 0 :\; X_t \in A\}\,.$$

The open ball in $\mathbb{R}^d$ centered at the origin, of radius $R > 0$, is denoted by B_R.

The Borel σ-field of a topological space E is denoted by $\mathfrak{B}(E)$, and $\mathfrak{P}(E)$ stands for the set of probability measures on $\mathfrak{B}(E)$. The space $\mathfrak{P}(E)$ is always viewed as endowed with the topology of weak convergence of probability measures (the Prohorov topology).

We introduce the following notation for spaces of real-valued functions on a domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. The space $\mathcal{C}^k(D)$ refers to the class of all functions whose partial derivatives up to order k exist and are continuous, and $\mathcal{C}^k_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the subspace of $\mathcal{C}^k(\mathbb{R}^d)$ consisting of those functions whose derivatives up to order k are bounded.

We also need the following definition.

Definition 1.1: A function $h\colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathcal{X}$ is a locally compact space, is called *inf-compact* on a set $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ if the set $\bar{A} \cap \{y :\; h(y) \leq \beta\}$ is compact (or empty) in $\mathcal{X}$ for all $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$. When this property holds for $A = \mathcal{X}$, then we simply say that h is inf-compact.

II. Sample Path Optimality for Uniformly Stable Diffusions

Recall that a control $v \in \mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{SM}}$ is called *stable* if the associated diffusion is positive recurrent. We let $\mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{SSM}}$ denote the set of stable controls, and let μ_v stand for the unique invariant probability measure of the diffusion process under the control $v \in \mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{SSM}}$. For $v \in \mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{SSM}}$, we define the *ergodic occupation measure* $\pi_v \in \mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U})$ by

$$\pi_v(\mathrm{d}x, \mathrm{d}u) \;:=\; \mu_v(\mathrm{d}x)\, v(\mathrm{d}u \mid x)\,,$$

and let $\mathcal{G}$ denote the set of ergodic occupation measures (see Section 3.2.1 in [4]). It is well known that that $\mathcal{G}$ is a closed and convex subset of $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U})$ [4, Lemma 3.2.3]. The controlled diffusion in (1) is called *uniformly stable* if the set of ergodic occupation measures is compact. It is well known that the following condition is sufficient for uniform stability: $\tau(D)$ is uniformly integrable with respect to $\{\mathbb{P}^v_x\colon v \in \mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{SM}}\}$ for some bounded open domain D, and some $x \in \bar{D}^c$. Conversely, if the controlled diffusion is uniformly stable then the uniform integrability property holds with respect to the larger family $\{\mathbb{P}^U_x\colon U \in \mathfrak{U}\}$, for any bounded open domain D and any $x \in \bar{D}^c$ over [4, Lemma 3.3.4].

It is well known (see [16, p. 19]) that uniform integrability of $\tau(D)$ is equivalent to the existence of some nonnegative $\phi \in \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{R}_+)$ satisfying $\phi(z) \to \infty$ as $z \to \infty$, and

$$\sup_{U \in \mathfrak{U}} \mathbb{E}^U_x\big[\tau(D)\phi\big(\tau(D)\big)\big] \;<\; \infty\,. \tag{9}$$

A question posed in [17, Remark 5.10 (i)] in the context of countable MDPs was whether uniform integrability of the hitting times is sufficient for pathwise optimality. A counterexample to this appeared very recently in [7]. Note though that the optimal control problem in this example is equivalent to minimizing the "$\liminf$" for a function which is bounded above. Even though this counterexample cannot be adapted for diffusions due to the nature of the transition probabilities, it suggests that (9) may not be sufficient for pathwise optimality. It turns out, however, that if (9) holds with $\phi = \ln^+$, uniformly over all x in compact subsets of D^c, then the family of empirical measures $\{\zeta^U_t :\; t \geq 0\}$ defined in (5) is a.s. tight for any $U \in \mathfrak{U}$.

As seen from the proof of [4, Theorem 3.4.11] the hypothesis of uniform boundedness of second moments of hitting times is used in applying Kolmogorov's strong law of large numbers for martingale difference sequences (for more details see [18, Lemma 2.12]). But this can be accomplished under weaker hypotheses. Let $\{Y_n\}$ be a sequence of integrable random variables defined on a complete probability space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{F}, \mathbb{P})$, and define $\mathfrak{F}_n := \sigma(Y_1, Y_2, \ldots, Y_n)$, and

$$S_n \;:=\; \sum_{k=1}^{n} \big(Y_k - \mathbb{E}\left[Y_k \mid \mathfrak{F}_{k-1}\right]\big)\,, \quad n \in \mathbb{N}\,.$$

Fairly recently, Stoica has established in [19, Theorem 2] that if $\sup_{n\in\mathbb{N}} \mathbb{E}\big[|Y_n|\,\ln^+|Y_n|\big] < \infty$, then it holds that

$$\frac{S_n}{n} \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\text{a.s.}} 0\,.$$

This result is sharp. As shown in [20], given any centered random variable Z satisfying $\mathbb{E}\big[|Z|\big] < \infty$, and $\mathbb{E}\big[|Z|\,\ln^+|Z|\big] = \infty$, there exists a martingale difference sequence $\{Z_n\}$ of identically distributed random variables, having the same law as Z, such that $\frac{Z_1+\cdots+Z_n}{n}$ diverges almost surely as $n\to\infty$.

We present the following theorem.

Theorem 2.1: Suppose that for some bounded domain $D\subset\mathbb{R}^d$, and any compact set $K\subset D^c$, it holds that

$$\sup_{x\in K}\,\sup_{U\in\mathfrak{U}}\,\mathbb{E}^U_x\big[\uptau(D)\ln^+\big(\uptau(D)\big)\big] \;<\; \infty\,.$$

Then $\{\zeta^U_t\colon\ t\ge 0\}$ is a.s. tight for any $U\in\mathfrak{U}$.

Proof: We follow the proof of [4, Theorem 3.4.11]. Without loss of generality we may assume D is an open ball. Let $\tilde D$ be a ball containing $\bar D$. Let $\hat\uptau_0=0$, and for $k=0,1,\dots$ define inductively an increasing sequence of stopping times by

$$\hat\uptau_{2k+1} := \inf\,\{t>\hat\uptau_{2k} : X_t\in\tilde D^c\}\,,$$
$$\hat\uptau_{2k+2} := \inf\,\{t>\hat\uptau_{2k+1} : X_t\in D\}\,.$$

The assumption of the theorem implies of course that $\uptau(D)$ satisfies (9), or, equivalently that it is uniformly integrable with respect to $\{\mathbb{P}^v_x\colon v\in\mathfrak{U}_{\rm SM}\}$. Thus, by Lemma 3.3.4 in [4] there exist inf-compact functions $\Phi\in\mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $h\colon\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{U}\to\mathbb{R}_+$, and a constant k_0, satisfying

$$\mathcal{L}^u\Phi(x) \;\le\; k_0 - h(x,u) \qquad \forall (x,u)\;\in\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{U}\,.$$

This implies that

$$\sup_{x\in\partial\tilde D}\,\sup_{U\in\mathfrak{U}}\,\mathbb{E}^U_x\left[\int_0^{\uptau(D)} h(X_t,U_t)\,\mathrm{d}t\right] < \infty\,.$$

Since h is inf-compact, and also $\inf\limits_{x\in\partial\tilde D}\,\inf\limits_{U\in\mathfrak{U}}\,\mathbb{E}^U_x\left[\uptau(D)\right] > 0$, it follows that set of probability measures ν defined by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f\,\mathrm{d}\nu = \frac{\mathbb{E}^U_{X_0}\left[\int_0^{\hat\uptau_2} f(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}t\right]}{\mathbb{E}^U_{X_0}\big[\hat\uptau_2\big]} \qquad \forall f\in\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)\,, \tag{10}$$

for $U\in\mathfrak{U}$, and with the law of X_0 supported on ∂D, is tight. By [4, Theorem 2.6.1 (b)], we have

$$\sup_{x\in\partial D}\,\inf_{U\in\mathfrak{U}}\,\mathbb{E}^U_x\left[\uptau^k(\tilde D^c)\right] < \infty$$

for any $k\in\mathbb{N}$. This, together with the hypothesis of the theorem, imply that

$$\sup_{x\in D}\,\sup_{U\in\mathfrak{U}}\,\mathbb{E}^U_x\big[\hat\uptau_2\ln^+\big(\hat\uptau_2\big)\big] \;<\; \infty\,.$$

Therefore, we can use the strong law of large numbers for a martingale difference sequence to deduce that, for all $f\in\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$\frac{1}{n}\int_0^{\hat\uptau_{2n}} f(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}t - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{m=0}^{n-1}\mathbb{E}^U_{X_0}\left[\int_{\hat\uptau_{2m}}^{\hat\uptau_{2m+2}} f(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}t\;\Big|\;\mathfrak{F}_{\hat\uptau_{2m}}\right] \xrightarrow[n\to\infty]{\text{a.s.}} 0 \tag{11}$$

for all $f\in\mathcal{C}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$. We then proceed as in the proof of [4, Theorem 3.4.11] to show, using (11) and the tightness of the measures ν defined in (10), that for any $\epsilon>0$ there exists $N(\epsilon)\in\mathbb{N}$ such that if $f_\ell\colon\mathbb{R}^d\to[0,1]$ is any continuous function which vanishes on B_ℓ and is equal to 1 on $B^c_{\ell+1}$, then

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty}\;\frac{1}{\hat\uptau_{2n}}\int_0^{\hat\uptau_{2n}} f_\ell(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}t \;\le\; \epsilon \quad\text{a.s.,}\quad \forall\,\ell\ge N(\epsilon)\,.$$

Then a standard approximation argument using the number of cycles completed at time t defined as $\varkappa(t) = \max\{k : t > \hat{\tau}_{2k}\}$ shows that

$$\limsup_t \frac{1}{t}\int_0^t f_\ell(X_t)\,\mathrm{d}t \;\le\; \epsilon \quad \text{a.s.}, \quad \forall\, \ell \ge N(\epsilon)\,,$$

which implies that the family of empirical measures $\{\zeta_t^U\}$ is a.s. tight. This completes the proof. □

We continue with the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1: Let D be a bounded $\mathcal{C}^2$ domain. If there exist nonnegative functions φ_1 and φ_2 in $\mathcal{C}^2(\bar{D}^c)\cap\mathcal{C}(D^c)$ satisfying, for some $v \in \mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{SM}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^v\varphi_1(x) \;&\le\; -1\,,\\ \mathcal{L}^v\varphi_2(x) \;&\le\; -\ln^+\bigl(\varphi_1(x)\bigr)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

for all $x \in \bar{D}^c$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x^v\bigl[\uptau(D)\bigr] \;&\le\; \varphi_1(x)\,,\\ \mathbb{E}_x^v\bigl[\uptau(D)\ln^+\bigl(\uptau(D)\bigr)\bigr] \;&\le\; 2\varphi_1(x) + \varphi_2(x)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

for all $x \in D^c$.

Proof: Without loss of generality, since φ_1 and φ_2 can always be scaled, we may assume that $\varphi_1 \ge 1$ on D^c. The first inequality in (13) is standard.

It is simple to verify that for any $T > 0$ we have

$$T\,\ln^+ T \;\le\; \int_0^T \ln^+(T-t)\,\mathrm{d}t + T\,. \tag{14}$$

Let $\hat{\uptau}_R := \uptau(D)\wedge\uptau(B_R^c)$, $R > 0$. Using Dynkin's formula, we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_x^v\left[\int_0^{\hat{\uptau}_R} \ln\bigl(\varphi_1(X_t)\bigr)\,\mathrm{d}t\right] \;\le\; \varphi_2(x)\,. \tag{15}$$

Conditioning at $t\wedge\hat{\uptau}_R$, and using optional sampling and Jensen's inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_x^v\left[\int_0^{\hat{\uptau}_R} \ln^+(\hat{\uptau}_R - t)\,\mathrm{d}t\right] \;&\le\; \mathbb{E}_x^v\left[\int_0^\infty \ln(\hat{\uptau}_R - t + 1)\,\mathbb{1}_{\{t<\hat{\uptau}_R\}}\,\mathrm{d}t\right]\\ &=\; \mathbb{E}_x^v\left[\int_0^\infty \mathbb{E}_x^v\Bigl[\ln(\hat{\uptau}_R - t + 1)\,\mathbb{1}_{\{t<\hat{\uptau}_R\}}\;\Big|\;\mathfrak{F}^X_{t\wedge\hat{\uptau}_R}\Bigr]\,\mathrm{d}t\right]\\ &\le\; \mathbb{E}_x^v\left[\int_0^\infty \mathbb{1}_{\{t\wedge\hat{\uptau}_R<\hat{\uptau}_R\}}\ln\bigl(\mathbb{E}^v_{X_{t\wedge\hat{\uptau}_R}}\bigl[\hat{\uptau}_R+1\bigr]\bigr)\,\mathrm{d}t\right]\\ &\le\; \mathbb{E}_x^v\left[\int_0^\infty \ln\bigl(\varphi_1(X_{t\wedge\hat{\uptau}_R})+1\bigr)\,\mathbb{1}_{\{t<\hat{\uptau}_R\}}\,\mathrm{d}t\right]\\ &\le\; \mathbb{E}_x^v\left[\int_0^{\hat{\uptau}_R}\bigl(\ln\bigl(\varphi_1(X_t)\bigr)+1\bigr)\,\mathrm{d}t\right], \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

where we use the inequality $\ln(z)+1 \ge \ln(z+1)$ for all $z \in [1,\infty)$. Combining (14)–(16), and letting $R\to\infty$, we obtain the second inequality in (13). □

Remark 2.1: It is evident from the proof of Lemma 2.1 that if we replace v in (12) by some $U \in \mathfrak{U}$, then (13) holds for the process controlled under U. Likewise, if (12) holds for all $u \in \mathbb{U}$, then (13) holds uniformly over $U \in \mathfrak{U}$.

Consider the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2.1: There exist a bounded domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and positive functions $\mathcal{V}_1$ and $\mathcal{V}_2$, with $\mathcal{V}_i \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $i = 1, 2$, such that

$$\mathcal{L}^u\mathcal{V}_1(x) \;\le\; -1\,, \tag{17a}$$

$$\mathcal{L}^u\mathcal{V}_2(x) \;\le\; -\ln^+\bigl(\mathcal{V}_1(x)\bigr) \tag{17b}$$

for all $x \in D^c$ and $u \in \mathbb{U}$.

We have the following corollary.

Corollary 2.1: Let Hypothesis 2.1 hold, and suppose that there exists $\hat{v} \in \mathfrak{U}_{\rm SSM}$ such that $\varrho_{\hat{v}}$ is finite. Then

(a) There exists a stationary Markov control which is average cost optimal.

(b) Every average cost optimal stationary Markov control is pathwise optimal.

Proof: As shown in [4, p. 65] for any bounded domain D it holds that $\mathbb{E}_x^U\big[\tau(D)\big] \to \infty$ as $|x| \to \infty$. Since by Itô's formula and (17a) we have $\mathcal{V}_1(x) \geq \mathbb{E}_x^U\big[\tau(D)\big]$ for all $U \in \mathfrak{U}$, it follows that $\mathcal{V}_1$ is inf-compact. Therefore, (17b) implies that the set of ergodic occupation measures $\mathcal{G}$ is compact (see Lemma 3.3.4 (iv) in [4]). Since c is bounded below, part (a) follows by [4, Theorem 3.4.5].

Part (b) follows by Theorem 2.1, Lemma 2.1, and Remark 2.1. □

The pair of Lyapunov equations in Hypothesis 2.1 may be replaced by a single equation, which in many cases it might be easier to verify (see Example 2.1 later in this section). Consider the following hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2.2: There exist an inf-compact function $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, with $\mathcal{V} \geq 1$, and a constant C such that

$$\mathcal{L}^u\mathcal{V}(x) \;\leq\; C - \ln\big(\mathcal{V}(x)\big) \qquad \forall\,(x,u) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U}\,. \tag{18}$$

Let D be an open ball such that $\ln\big(\mathcal{V}(x)\big) \geq 2C+1$ for $x \in D^c$. Then, if we define $\mathcal{V}_1 := \mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{V}_2 := 2\mathcal{V}$, it is clear that (18) implies (17a)–(17b). Thus Hypothesis 2.2 implies Hypothesis 2.1. The Foster–Lyapunov condition in (18) results in subgeometric ergodicity for the process [21, Theorems 3.2 and 3.4]. A similar estimate as in Lemma 2.1 can be derived directly from (18), albeit we have to restrict to stationary controls. Without loss of generality, let $\phi(y) := 1 + \ln(y)$, $y \in [1,\infty)$ and select D and a constant C such that

$$\mathcal{L}^u\mathcal{V}(x) \;\leq\; C\,\mathbb{1}_D(x) - \phi\big(\mathcal{V}(x)\big) \qquad \forall\,(x,u) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U}\,. \tag{19}$$

Let $\mathcal{I}\colon [1,\infty) \to \mathbb{R}_+$ denote the 'shifted' logarithmic integral

$$\mathcal{I}(z) \;:=\; \int_1^z \frac{\mathrm{d}s}{1+\ln(s)}\,.$$

Combining the identity $\big(\mathcal{I}^{-1}\big)'(z) = \phi\big(\mathcal{I}^{-1}(z)\big)$ and [21, Theorem 4.1] we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}_x^v\big[\mathcal{I}^{-1}\big(\tau(D)\big)\big] \;\leq\; \mathcal{V}(x) - 1 \qquad \forall\, x \in D^c\,, \quad \forall v \in \mathfrak{U}_{\rm SM}\,.$$

Since $\mathcal{I}^{-1}(z)$ grows as $\mathcal{O}(z\ln(z))$, the estimate of Theorem 2.1 follows.

The Foster–Lyapunov condition in (19) implies that, under any stationary control, the process is ergodic at a logarithmic rate. Indeed, applying [21, Theorem 3.2] with Ψ_1 the identity function, and $\Psi_2 = 1$, it follows by (3.5) in [21] that there exists a positive constant C_0, such that

$$\big\|P_t^v(x,\,\cdot\,) - \mu_v(\,\cdot\,)\big\|_{\rm TV} \;\leq\; \frac{C_0}{\ln(t+1)}\,\mathcal{V}(x) \quad \forall\,(t,x) \in (0,\infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d\,,$$

and for all $v \in \mathfrak{U}_{\rm SM}$, where $\|\,\cdot\,\|_{\rm TV}$ stands for the total variation norm. See also [22, p. 1364] for the corresponding results for Markov chains. For some other recent developments in this topic see [21]–[25].

The following is an example of a uniformly stable controlled diffusion which satisfies $\mathbb{E}_x^v[\tau(D)^p] = \infty$ for all $p > 1$, and all $v \in \mathfrak{U}_{\rm SM}$, but $\mathbb{E}_x^v\big[\tau(D)\ln^+\big(\tau(D)\big)\big] < \infty$.

Example 2.1: Consider the one-dimensional controlled diffusion

$$\mathrm{d}X_t \;=\; -\frac{X_t\Big(1 + \big[\ln(2+X_t^2)\big]^{-1/2}\,U_t\Big)}{2+X_t^2}\,\mathrm{d}t + \sqrt{2}\,\mathrm{d}W_t\,, \tag{20}$$

with $\mathbb{U} = [1,2]$. We apply Theorem 3 (c) in [26] with $A(x) := 2$, $B(x) := 2$ and

$$C(x) \;:=\; -\frac{x^2\Big(1 + \big[\ln(2+x^2)\big]^{-1/2}\,v(x)\Big)}{2+x^2}\,.$$

It then follows that for any $v \in \mathfrak{U}_{\rm SM}$, $r > 0$, $|x| > r$, and $p > 1$, we have $\mathbb{E}_x^v[\tau(B_r)^p] = \infty$. Here, $B_r = [-r,r]$. Thus the hitting times do not have any moments larger than 1.

Let $\mathcal{V}(x) := 1+x^2\big[\ln(2+x^2)\big]^2$. A straightforward calculation shows that for some large enough constant $\kappa > 0$ we have

$$\mathcal{L}^u\mathcal{V}(x) \;\le\; \kappa - \frac{3}{2}\left[\ln(2+x^2)\right]^{3/2} \qquad \forall\,(x,u) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U}\,. \tag{21}$$

This of course can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}^u\mathcal{V}(x) \;\le\; C - \ln\big(\mathcal{V}(x)\big) \qquad \forall\,(x,u) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U}\,,$$

for some large enough constant C. Therefore, Hypothesis 2.2 is satisfied. Let $h(x) := \big[\ln(2+x^2)\big]^{3/2}$. By (21) and Itô's formula we obtain $\int_{\mathbb{R}} h(x)\,\mu_v(\mathrm{d}x) \le \frac{2}{3}\kappa$ for all $v \in \mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{SM}}$. In addition, (21) implies that the set of ergodic occupation measures is compact. It then follows by Corollary 2.1 (a), that if c is a running cost which is bounded below and such that $x \mapsto \max_{u\in\mathbb{U}}|c(x,u)|$ does not grow faster than $\big(\ln^+|x|\big)^{3/2}$, then there exists $v^* \in \mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{SSM}}$ which is average cost optimal for the diffusion in (20) [4, Theorem 3.4.5]. Moreover, every average cost optimal stationary Markov control is pathwise optimal by Corollary 2.1 (b).

Remark 2.2: If the running cost c is not bounded below, one may obtain the same results by considering the modulated hitting times

$$\mathcal{T}(D) \;:=\; \int_0^{\tau(D)} \max_{u\in\mathbb{U}} |c(X_t,u)|\,\mathrm{d}t\,.$$

Theorem 2.1 then still holds if we replace τ with $\mathcal{T}$ in the hypothesis. Analogously, if we replace (17a) by

$$\mathcal{L}^u\mathcal{V}_1(x) \;\le\; -g(x) \qquad \forall\,(x,u) \in \bar{D}^c \times \mathbb{U}\,,$$

where $g \ge 1$ is some function that grows at least as fast as the map $x \mapsto \max_{u\in\mathbb{U}}|c(x,u)|$, then Corollary 2.1 remains valid for a running cost c which is not necessarily bounded below.

III. Sample path optimality for a general class of diffusions

The running cost is called *near-monotone* if there exists some $\epsilon > 0$ such that the level set $\{(x,u) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{U}\colon c(x,u) \le \varrho_* + \epsilon\}$ is compact. It is well known that if the running cost is near-monotone then every average cost optimal stationary Markov control is necessarily pathwise optimal [4, Theorem 3.4.7]. In this Section we consider a general class of ergodic control problems for which the diffusion is not uniformly stable, and the running cost is not near monotone. They are characterized by the property that the running cost is near monotone when restricted to some subset $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, while a suitable Foster–Lyapunov condition holds on $\mathcal{K}^c$. Models of this nature appear, for example, as the limiting diffusions of multiclass queueing networks in the Halfin–Whitt regime [27].

Consider the following assumption.

Assumption 3.1: For some open subset $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the following hold.

(i) There exists $\hat{U} \in \mathfrak{U}$ such that $\varrho_{\hat{U}} < \infty$.

(ii) The level sets $\{(x,u) \in \mathcal{K} \times \mathbb{U}\colon c(x,u) \le \gamma\}$ are bounded (or are empty) for all $\gamma \in (0,\infty)$.

(iii) For some smooth increasing concave function $\phi\colon \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$, satisfying $\phi(z) \to \infty$ as $z \to \infty$, some positive inf-compact function $\mathcal{V} \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and some positive constants κ_i, $i = 0,1,2$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^u\mathcal{V}(x) \;&\le\; \kappa_0 - \kappa_1\,\phi\big(\mathcal{V}(x)\big) \qquad \forall\,(x,u) \in \mathcal{K}^c \times \mathbb{U}\,,\\ \mathcal{L}^u\mathcal{V}(x) \;&\le\; \kappa_2\big(1 + c(x,u)\big) \qquad \forall\,(x,u) \in \mathcal{K} \times \mathbb{U}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

(iv) The functions σ and $\frac{\nabla\mathcal{V}}{1+\phi(\mathcal{V})}$ are bounded on $\mathbb{R}^d$.

Observe that when $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{R}^d$ then the problem reduces to an ergodic control problem with near-monotone running cost, whereas if $\mathcal{K}$ is bounded, we obtain an ergodic control problem for a uniformly stable controlled diffusion.

Theorem 3.1: Let Assumption 3.1 hold. Then

(a) There exists $v^* \in \mathfrak{U}_{\mathrm{SSM}}$ which is average cost optimal.

(b) Every average cost optimal stationary Markov control is stable and pathwise optimal.

Proof: Part (a) follows by [27, Theorem 3.1], which also shows that an average cost optimal stationary Markov control is necessarily stable.

To prove part (b), define $\psi_N\colon \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}_+$, for $N \in \mathbb{N}$, by

$$\psi_N(z) \;:=\; \int_0^z \frac{1}{N+\phi(y)}\,\mathrm{d}y\,,$$

and $\varphi_N\colon \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}_+$ by

$$\varphi_N(x) \;:=\; \psi_N\big(\mathcal{V}(x)\big)\,, \qquad x \in \mathbb{R}^d\,.$$

Let $U \in \mathfrak{U}$ be some admissible control such that

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{U}} c(x,u)\,\zeta^U_{t_n}(\mathrm{d}x,\mathrm{d}u) \;<\; \infty\,, \tag{23}$$

for some increasing divergent sequence $\{t_n\}$. Since c is inf-compact on $\mathcal{K}\times\mathbb{U}$, it follows that $\zeta^U_{t_n}$ is a.s. tight when restricted to $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{K}\times\mathbb{U})$. Since $\nabla\varphi_N$ and $\upsigma$ are bounded, by Itô's formula and (22) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\varphi_N(X_t)-\varphi_N(X_0)}{t} \;=\; \frac{1}{t}\,\int_0^t \mathcal{L}^{U_s}\varphi_N(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}s \\ + \frac{1}{t}\,\int_0^t \langle \nabla\varphi_N(X_s), \upsigma(X_s)\,\mathrm{d}W_s\rangle\,.\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Arguing as in [4, Lemma 3.4.6], it follows that the second term on the right hand side of (8) converges a.s. to 0 as $t\to\infty$. We have

$$\mathcal{L}^u\varphi_N(x) \;\le\; \begin{cases} \frac{\kappa_0-\kappa_1\phi(\mathcal{V}(x))}{N+\phi(\mathcal{V}(x))} + h_N(x) & \text{on } \mathcal{K}^c\,,\\ \frac{\kappa_2(1+c(x,u))}{N+\phi(\mathcal{V}(x))} + h_N(x) & \text{on } \mathcal{K}\,,\end{cases}$$

where

$$h_N(x) \;:=\; -\phi'\big(\mathcal{V}(x)\big)\,\frac{\big|\upsigma^{\mathsf{T}}(x)\nabla\mathcal{V}(x)\big|^2}{\big(N+\phi(\mathcal{V}(x))\big)^2}\,, \qquad x\in\mathbb{R}^d\,.$$

Hence, by (23)–(24), for some constant C we obtain

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathcal{K}^c\times\mathbb{U}} \frac{\phi\big(\mathcal{V}(x)\big)}{N+\phi\big(\mathcal{V}(x)\big)}\,\zeta^U_{t_n}(\mathrm{d}x,\mathrm{d}u) \;\le\; \frac{C}{N}\,,$$

from which it follows that $\zeta^U_{t_n}$ is a.s. tight when restricted to $\mathfrak{B}(\mathcal{K}^c\times\mathbb{U})$. Therefore, it is a.s. tight in $\mathfrak{P}(\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{U})$. Hence, almost surely every limit point of $\{\zeta^U_{t_n}\}$ is an ergodic occupation measure [4, Lemma 3.4.6]. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\liminf_{n\to\infty}\; \frac{1}{t_n}\int_0^{t_n} c(X_s,U_s)\,\mathrm{d}s \;&\ge\; \inf_{\pi\in\mathcal{G}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{U}} c(x,u)\,\pi(\mathrm{d}x,\mathrm{d}u)\\ &=\; \varrho_*\,.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

IV. Conclusions

It is well known that uniform stability, or equivalently, uniform integrability of the hitting times, is equivalent to the existence of a solution to the Lyapunov equation

$$\mathcal{L}^u\mathcal{V}(x) \;\le\; C - g(x) \qquad \forall\,(x,u)\in\mathbb{R}^d\times\mathbb{U}\,, \tag{25}$$

for some inf-compact function g and a constant C. Comparing (18) to (25), it follows that if $\mathcal{V}$ grows no faster than e^g then the conclusions of Corollary 2.1 follow. This closes significantly the gap between uniform stability and sufficient conditions for pathwise optimality.

Even though the results of Section II are specialized to controlled diffusions, they are directly applicable to irreducible MDPs with a countable state space, i.e., the model treated in [5].

REFERENCES

[1] P. Dai Pra, G. B. Di Masi, and B. Trivellato, "Pathwise optimality in stochastic control," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 39, no. 5, pp. 1540–1557 (electronic), 2000.

[2] V. S. Borkar, *Optimal control of diffusion processes*, ser. Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics Series. Harlow: Longman Scientific & Technical, 1989, vol. 203.

[3] V. S. Borkar and M. K. Ghosh, "Ergodic control of multidimensional diffusions. I. The existence results," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 26, no. 1, pp. 112–126, 1988.

[4] A. Arapostathis, V. S. Borkar, and M. K. Ghosh, *Ergodic control of diffusion processes*, ser. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012, vol. 143.

[5] V. S. Borkar, "Control of Markov chains with long-run average cost criterion: the dynamic programming equations," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp. 642–657, 1989.

[6] R. Cavazos-Cadena and R. Montes-de Oca, "Sample-path optimality in average Markov decision chains under a double Lyapunov function condition," in *Optimization, control, and applications of stochastic systems*, ser. Systems Control Found. Appl. Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2012, pp. 31–57.

[7] R. Cavazos-Cadena, R. Montes-de Oca, and K. Sladký, "A counterexample on sample-path optimality in stable Markov decision chains with the average reward criterion," *J. Optim. Theory Appl.*, vol. 163, no. 2, pp. 674–684, 2014.

[8] ——, "Sample-path optimal stationary policies in stable Markov decision chains with the average reward criterion," *J. Appl. Probab.*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 419–440, 2015.

[9] O. Hernández-Lerma, O. Vega-Amaya, and G. Carrasco, "Sample-path optimality and variance-minimization of average cost Markov control processes," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 79–93 (electronic), 1999.

[10] Q. X. Zhu, "Sample-path optimality and variance-maximization for Markov decision processes," *Math. Methods Oper. Res.*, vol. 65, no. 3, pp. 519–538, 2007.

[11] F. Y. Hunt, "Sample path optimality for a Markov optimization problem," *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, vol. 115, no. 5, pp. 769–779, 2005.

[12] J. B. Lasserre, "Sample-path average optimality for Markov control processes," *IEEE Trans. Automat. Control*, vol. 44, no. 10, pp. 1966–1971, 1999.

[13] I. Gyöngy and N. Krylov, "Existence of strong solutions for Itô's stochastic equations via approximations," *Probab. Theory Related Fields*, vol. 105, no. 2, pp. 143–158, 1996.

[14] V. I. Bogachev, N. V. Krylov, and M. Röckner, "On regularity of transition probabilities and invariant measures of singular diffusions under minimal conditions," *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, vol. 26, no. 11-12, pp. 2037–2080, 2001.

[15] W. Stannat, "(Nonsymmetric) Dirichlet operators on L^1: existence, uniqueness and associated Markov processes," *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 99–140, 1999.

[16] P.-A. Meyer, *Probability and potentials*. Blaisdell Publishing Co. Ginn and Co., Waltham, Mass.-Toronto, Ont.-London, 1966.

[17] A. Arapostathis, V. S. Borkar, E. Fernández-Gaucherand, M. K. Ghosh, and S. I. Marcus, "Discrete-time controlled Markov processes with average cost criterion: a survey," *SIAM J. Control Optim.*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 282–344, 1993.

[18] V. S. Borkar, "Convex analytic methods in Markov decision processes," in *Handbook of Markov decision processes*, ser. Internat. Ser. Oper. Res. Management Sci. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Boston, MA, 2002, vol. 40, pp. 347–375.

[19] G. Stoica, "A note on the rate of convergence in the strong law of large numbers for martingales," *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, vol. 381, no. 2, pp. 910–913, 2011.

[20] J. Elton, "A law of large numbers for identically distributed martingale differences," *Ann. Probab.*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 405–412, 1981.

[21] R. Douc, G. Fort, and A. Guillin, "Subgeometric rates of convergence of f-ergodic strong Markov processes," *Stochastic Process. Appl.*, vol. 119, no. 3, pp. 897–923, 2009.

[22] R. Douc, G. Fort, E. Moulines, and P. Soulier, "Practical drift conditions for subgeometric rates of convergence," *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 1353–1377, 2004.

[23] D. Bakry, P. Cattiaux, and A. Guillin, "Rate of convergence for ergodic continuous Markov processes: Lyapunov versus Poincaré," *J. Funct. Anal.*, vol. 254, no. 3, pp. 727–759, 2008.

[24] G. Fort and G. O. Roberts, "Subgeometric ergodicity of strong Markov processes," *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 1565–1589, 2005.

[25] M. Hairer, "Convergence of Markov Processes," Lecture Notes, University of Warwick, 2016.

[26] S. Balaji and S. Ramasubramanian, "Passage time moments for multidimensional diffusions," *J. Appl. Probab.*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 246–251, 2000.

[27] A. Arapostathis, A. Biswas, and G. Pang, "Ergodic control of multi-class $M/M/N+M$ queues in the Halfin-Whitt regime," *Ann. Appl. Probab.*, vol. 25, no. 6, pp. 3511–3570, 2015.